U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NOVEMBER 9, 2000

November 2000

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
NATIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NOVEMBER 9, 2000

by

Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.
6352 South U.S. Highway 51
P.O. Box 1316
Carbondale, IL 62903
(618) 549-2832

A Report Submitted to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3868

under

Task Order #25
Contract No. DACW72-99-D-0005

November 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NATIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the National Listening Session in Washington, District of Columbia on November 9, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected attachments are provided in this document.

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As stewards of America's water resources for more than 200 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers conducted a dialogue with the American public, stakeholders, customers, and government agencies at all levels about the water resources challenges that lie ahead. The Corps held 14 regional public listening sessions throughout the United States between June and September of 2000 to provide citizens the opportunity to voice concerns about pressing water resources problems, opportunities, and needs impacting their lives, communities, and future sustainability. The dialogue generated at the sessions is an integral part of the Corps' strategic planning process.

The cities where the regional listening sessions were conducted included St. Louis, MO; Sacramento, CA; Phoenix, AZ; Woburn, MA; Atlanta, GA; Omaha, NE; Honolulu, HI; Chicago, IL; Louisville, KY; Dallas, TX; Williamsburg, VA; New Brunswick, NJ; Anchorage, AK; and, Vancouver, WA.

This report summarizes the second of two national listening sessions. The session was held in Washington, District of Columbia and was hosted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and its Institute for Water Resources (IWR). The listening session was conducted at the Crystal Gateway Marriott in Arlington, Virginia. Approximately 65 people attended this meeting (not including Corps participants and the facilitation team) to share their views with the Corps.

The information collected from the 14 regional listening sessions and 2 national listening sessions will be incorporated into a series of reports assessing future national water resources needs and the gaps that must be closed to meet these needs. The reports will be shared with key decision-makers within the Army and Congress to help inform their discussions about water resources issues and future investment decisions. Additionally, the reports will provide a point of departure for ensuing discussions with other Federal agencies to identify common water resources issues and missions most appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the Federal government. The information will also be incorporated into a revision of the Civil Works Program Strategic Plan.

Welcoming Remarks

Major General Hans A. Van Winkle, USACE Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works, welcomed everyone to the session. He assumed a few additional participants would be arriving late because of the election activities. General Van Winkle expressed his excitement for

the session and said he was very enthusiastic. He explained to the participants the Corps recently completed 14 regional sessions across the Nation. Furthermore, the Corps was conducting 2 additional national listening sessions to present the findings from the regional sessions and gain input from a national perspective. General Van Winkle requested that participants try to put aside the political election issues and focus on the issues relating to national water resources needs. Participants were asked to concentrate on the challenges related to water resources. The intent of the Corps was to listen to comments and suggestions presented by participants. General Van Winkle added that the sessions were not designed to receive water resources challenges exclusively applicable to the Corps. The sessions were designed to allow for a broader perspective on water resources that applied to a variety of other Federal agencies, along with State agencies and local entities.

General Van Winkle explained that the Corps was ordered to develop a civil works strategic plan in 1993 and revisions were required periodically. He went on to say the Corps is involved in large, national issues, but is not heavily involved in interagency policy. General Van Winkle acknowledged that some participants stressed a need for the Corps to have a broader policy. General Van Winkle continued by presenting an overview of water resources challenges the Corps identified prior to the regional sessions. The first challenge related to water borne commerce. General Van Winkle felt the Nation needed to improve the marine transportation system in order to keep up with future demand and use. Next, General Van Winkle presented flooding as a national challenge. He explained that inadequate flood protection was a Federal responsibility that required attention. Additionally, decisions would need to be made relating to the implementation of structural or non-structural flood control options. General Van Winkle continued by saying the Corps needed to ensure sufficient water supplies for future national demands. General Van Winkle voiced concerns regarding the role the Federal government had in managing upstream/downstream allocations, regulations, and coordination. General Van Winkle thought consistent water management, which included State and regional entities, was something of concern.

General Van Winkle concluded by reiterating the Corps was holding this session to present the findings from the regional sessions, to see if the participants agreed with the findings, and to obtain additional input regarding the previous findings. The intent was to gather as much additional information as possible. With that, General Van Winkle thanked the audience for taking time out of their busy schedules to assist in this important forum developed to address the Nation's water resources and felt the participants would be helpful in providing useful information. General Van Winkle then introduced Mr. Mark Gmitro from the Corps' Institute for Water Resources, who would present the findings from the regional sessions, along with the 18 developed themes.

Overview of Regional Sessions and Themes

Mr. Gmitro first explained the purpose of the listening sessions, reminding the participants the Corps wanted to engage in dialogue with as many participants/stakeholders as possible regarding current and future water resources issues. To assist in this, the Corps developed a website (http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges) to increase

communication between agencies and stakeholders. The website would also serve as a site for the transference of information relating to the Nation's water resources challenges. The information generated on the website and developed from the listening sessions would be used to assist in the revision of the current Strategic Plan.

Mr. Gmitro explained that 14 regional listening sessions were held. The sessions were held in St. Louis, MO; Sacramento, CA; Phoenix, AZ; Woburn, MA; Atlanta, GA; Omaha, NE; Honolulu, HI; Chicago, IL; Louisville, KY; Dallas, TX; Williamsburg, VA; New Brunswick, NJ; Anchorage, AK; and, Vancouver, WA. Mr. Gmitro admitted that more sessions were preferred, but time and funding constraints limited the number of locations. Mr. Gmitro then went into the findings developed from the 14 sessions. The identification of challenges at the chosen session locations was fairly consistent, which assisted in the development of national water resources challenge themes. Mr. Gmitro added that the number of participants at each session varied, but the Corps did not intend to obtain equal (or random) representation, rather to promote productive participation. Overall, 1,245 participants attended the 14 sessions and they identified 536 challenges. These 536 challenges were assessed and categorized into 18 challenge themes. Participants provided an abundance of comments related to the challenges as additional feedback.

Mr. Gmitro went on to present the 18 challenge themes developed from the challenges identified at the sessions. He described each theme and discussed them briefly. The theme list developed from the regional sessions is described below along with related keywords.

Theme No.	Theme (groupings of challenges) with some related keywords
1	**Integrated water resources management and planning** (Challenges primarily associated with basin-level (watershed) planning and multi-objective/systems approach to analysis.)
2	**Communication and coordination** (Challenges primarily associated with stakeholder participation, interagency cooperation, and public education.)
3	**Regulatory issues/aspects of water resources** (Challenges primarily associated with land and water resources, permitting processes (e.g. Section 404, 1125 permits), including calls for regulatory reform.)
4	**Floodplain management** (Challenges primarily associated with traditional structural and non-structural flood control activities and water control in the riparian zone.)
5	**Marine transportation system** (Challenges primarily associated with waterborne navigation, including deep draft and inland waterway improvements, such as channel dredging, port development, lock modernization and channel safety.)

6 **Environmental/ecosystems health and management** (Challenges primarily associated with environmental restoration and preservation, including issues related to habitat, biodiversity, human interference, and invasive/exotic species.)

7 **Federal funding** (Challenges primarily associated with funding issues (budgets and costs), including cost-sharing rules and allocations.)

8 **Water quality** (Challenges primarily associated with source water protection, including surface and groundwater resources and impacts on non-point source pollution.)

9 **Emergency response** (Challenges primarily associated with catastrophic failure of infrastructure and related ability to respond to emergencies.)

10 **Water supply** (Challenges primarily associated with the quantity of water available and existing infrastructure for potable and other demands, such as agricultural water needs, and the allocation of water among competing interests.)

11 **Wastewater collection** (Challenges primarily associated with storm water collection, septic systems, and sewer infrastructure.)

12 **General water resources infrastructure** (Challenges primarily associated with generic concerns over aging water related infrastructure.)

13 **Data collection, analysis, and dissemination** (Challenges primarily associated with developing and sharing data to understand various water resources issues and relationships, including such items as mapping/GIS, new technologies, and systems modeling.)

14 **Corps project delivery process** (Challenges primarily associated with Corps procedures used in phases of Corps project planning and implementation, from Reconnaissance to Construction.)

15 **Federal and Corps water resources policy** (Challenges primarily associated with Federal roles, including reform, potential changes in missions and responsibilities, and opportunities to either streamline or expand the Corps involvement.)

16 **Recreation** (Challenges primarily associated with access to and quality of water-based recreation activities, such as fishing and boating, and a balance with related and potentially competing commercial uses of water.)

17 **Smart growth and development** (Challenges primarily associated with sustainability of current land and water management practices, including issues such as urban sprawl, brownfield clean-up, and other urban development pressures.)

18 **Coastal/shoreline management** (Challenges primarily associated with the National and Great Lakes shorelines, including beach erosion and restoration, and construction and maintenance of seawalls and jetties.)

Mr. Gmitro reiterated the information generated during this national session would be compiled in a report, which would be posted on the Corps' "national challenges" web site (listed on the back of the Join the Dialogue brochure) at http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges for others to review. Furthermore, a National Summary Report would be compiled from the information gathered at the 14 regional sessions and separate reports would be prepared for the national sessions, all of which would be used in the revision of the Strategic Plan and for future decision-makers to review. Mr. Gmitro was hopeful that additional discussions between the various agencies would occur once the listening sessions were completed. Mr. Gmitro emphasized to participants the information to date has already led to assisting in the development of the Strategic Plan and that the additional information would also be utilized. Lastly, Mr. Gmitro explained the information from the listening sessions would be provided to other agencies for review so they may identify potential areas of concern relating to their respective agency. Mr. Gmitro then turned the floor over to Dale Brown, the session facilitator representing Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd., for further explanation of the session activities.

Session Format

Mr. Brown began by explaining his previous involvement in the regional sessions and the recent national session held in San Diego. He then took a moment to introduce the other members of the facilitation team and explained to participants that other sub-facilitators would be providing assistance during portions of the session workshop. Mr. Brown requested participants inspect the Corps' brochure provided at the tables and observe the Corps website address listed on the back portion. He wanted participants to know the reports from each session would be posted on this website for review. Furthermore, additional comments or statements could be provided to the Corps via the website if participants chose to do so after the session.

Mr. Brown went on to explain to participants the importance of a simple information tool referred to as "stickies", which were self- adhesive yellow comment sheets. These sheets would be provided at each table and were to be used by participants to note challenges or other comments relative to water resources. During the discussion period participants would be asked to fill out the stickies with comments related to the challenge they chose. Mr. Brown added that additional stickies could also be filled out for other themes of concern and for participants to fill out as many as possible as often as possible. Mr. Brown explained that the stickies would be included as comments relative to each respective theme and included as an attachment in the session report. The Corps, as part of the study process, would also review the comments.

Mr. Brown then proceeded to discuss the structure of the day's Listening Session. He briefly outlined the proposed agenda of the current workshop for the audience. Although the agenda was intended to serve as a general guide to the day's activities, the agenda could be

modified at the facilitator's discretion as appropriate for the particular audience. The agenda was presented as follows:

9:00-9:10 (A.M.)	Opening remarks
9:10-9:30	What COE has heard
9:30-9:40	Overview of workshop
9:40-9:50	Dot-voting
9:50-10:05	Form focus groups
10:05-11:20	Small Group Discussion
11:20-11:45	Reconvene
11:45-12:50	Small Group Report Outs
12:50-1:00	Closing Remarks

Mr. Brown pointed out to participants the 18 challenge themes were posted around the room on large butcher pad paper along with an additional "other" theme for participants that identified challenges different than what was identified. Mr. Brown continued by saying each participant would be given five self-adhesive dots, which they were to use for voting. The dots would need to be affixed to the challenge theme(s) they felt were most important. They would have the option of voting however they wanted, for example, with one dot on each of five themes or five dots on one theme. After all votes were cast, the top six themes with the most dots would be considered as the main priority themes and designated for more detailed small group discussions. Four of these small groups discussion would occur in the main meeting room and two others would be set up in smaller rooms nearby. This dispersal of small groups would allow for less interference between groups during open discussion and potential debate. The basis of discussion would be to decide what actions need to be taken and what would be the role of the Federal government. Each participant would need to select a theme for which they wanted to participate in the small group discussion. However, participants would be able to switch to other theme discussion groups if interested in various challenge themes. The designated spokesperson for each discussion group would need to stay with the respective group for the entire discussion period to develop notes for the report out given to the entire group.

Mr. Brown added that during the small group discussion, each discussion group would have a sub-facilitator to assist in keeping the group focused, promote meaningful communication among participants, and take any needed notes. The first part of the small discussion period would be set aside to allow participants the opportunity to fill out the stickies with challenges or ideas relative to the theme of discussion. Mr. Brown stressed that these yellow stickies were an important part of the data collection effort and for participants to use them for capturing ideas and affix them to the theme it relates to. Mr. Brown continued by saying the participants would then need to introduce themselves, meet the facilitator, present and discuss the comments generated on the stickies, develop actions that should be taken, and determine the roles of the Corps, or other Federal, State, or local agencies in these challenges. Mr. Brown concluded by urging the group spokespersons to take notes of the discussion for which they were responsible. The spokesperson would need to present the information generated during the discussion to the entire group.

Lastly, Mr. Brown asked the participants to efficiently affix their dots to the theme(s) they felt were most important, which were posted around the room. After they posted their votes, the participants were asked to promptly return to their seats so that the votes could be counted and top themes chosen.

Theme Voting

Participants were asked to post their five dot-votes on the 18 themes posted on the butcher pads around the room. After the voting was completed, Mr. Brown asked a Corps member to read aloud the number of votes for each theme. The following list depicts the results of the dot-voting conducted by the session participants.

THEME NO.	THEME	DOT_VOTES
1	Integrated Water Resources Mgt. and Planning	14
2	Communication and Coordination	8
3	Regulatory Issues/Aspects of Water Resources	9
4	Floodplain Management	25
5	Marine Transportation System	32
6	Environmental/Ecosystem Health and Mgt.	31
7	Federal Funding	32
8	Water Quality	25
9	Emergency Response	11
10	Water Supply	20
11	Wastewater Collection	11
12	General Water Resources Infrastructure	17
13	Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination	13
14	Corps Project Delivery Processes	2
15	Federal and Corps Water Resources Policy	18
16	Recreation	34
17	Smart Growth and Development	8
18	Coastal/Shoreline Management	9

Mr. Brown reminded participants to write down any additional comments that may have come to mind during the voting on the yellow stickies. Based on the available space and the number of participants, the six top challenge themes were chosen for further discussion. Mr. Brown asked the participants to raise their hand to show which of the six challenge themes each participant would attend first. Mr. Brown then directed the participants to the areas in which their respective theme would be posted and introduced the sub-facilitators for each challenge theme. He briefly went over the discussion instructions again and emphasized what needed to be addressed. Lastly, the participants were given 15 minutes to relocate to the theme they wished to discuss.

Small Group Discussion and Related Report Outs

Based on the dot-voting results, the following challenge themes were chosen for further discussion:

(34 votes)	Recreation (Theme #16)
(32)	Marine Transportation System (Theme #5)
(32)	Federal Funding (Theme #7)
(31)	Environmental/Ecosystem Health and Management (Theme #6)
(25)	Water Quality (Theme #8)
(25)	Floodplain Management (Theme #4)

Before commencing the discussions, Mr. Brown asked the participants to follow the set of instructions described earlier (select a spokesperson, identify water challenges, discuss why they are important to you and what the Federal, State, or local role may be, and report the information to the large group). He specified that the participants should assume they have the authority to implement changes. The participants discussed the six challenge themes for more than an hour, keeping in mind the instructions previously mentioned. After the challenge themes were examined and various solutions were developed, each spokesperson was asked to present the information.

Although participants were given basic instruction for discussing the themes, no set method was required for generating information. As a result, some of the groups focused on discussing the challenges associated with the theme and various solutions rather than what roles the Federal government (or other entity) had to fill in addressing these challenges. If the various roles were not directly identified, then no roles were assumed or implied. If information generated during the discussions is associated with a particular role of the Federal government or other entity then it is included in italics (e.g. *Federal government*). The information generated during the discussion of selected themes is provided below:[1]

Recreation Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Work better with the Corps.
  - Input on number of releases at high demand times (flow from dam).
- Want more flow for economic development and tourism.
  - Include advance notice.
  - Have water release during the day, not at night.
- Increase downstream recreation - limited availability of river miles and gradient of rivers for white water river activities.
- Optimize water management, management of dams and when water is released.

[1] The challenges are listed in the order of priority from the dot voting in the first group discussion, rather than in actual order of presentation.

  - Examples: Gallery river and Somerville dam.
- *Corps*: Develop a downstream policy to play a more significant role in downstream releases/uses.
  - Go to Congress.
  - Need legislation to insure recreation as a purpose.
- Give recreation appropriate consideration and a higher priority regarding the management of national recreation lakes.
  - 450 lakes managed by the Corps.
  - Policy on Corps lakes fixed on statutes from the 1920s and 1930s.
  - Recreation $400 billion a year industry.
- *Corps*: Expand capacity of lakes to deal with growing demand for recreation.
  - Capacity static for the past two decades.
- *Corps*: Optimize water management, management of dams, and when water is released.
- Need more dredging for recreation, not just for commerce needs.
- Increase ability to provide for quality recreation, visitor satisfaction, and adequate facilities.
  - Better access and parking areas.
  - Customize aging Federal facilities.
  - Provides target of opportunity for concessions (relating to transportation, infrastructure, preservation).
- Address the perception that hydrological alterations have degraded ecosystems and created an unbalanced treatment of environmental concerns.
  - Related to upgrades, not pre-budgeted implementations.
- *Corps*: Address the over abundance of debris in waterways.
  - Areas such as tidal estuary (Delaware).
  - Neglecting 1899 Rivers and Harbors Act that requires this to be addressed.
- Improve lines of communication between Federal agencies and recreation industry.
- Communicate and educate agencies about the sources of waterway debris.
  - Relating to natural and manmade debris.
- Have the success show by the quality of surface water.
  - Develop challenges related to human use.
  - Develop capacity to integrate Federal, State, and local policies and issues.
- Create a framework and apply a framework approach that would define responsibilities and highlight management.
- Need for a regional compact to look at river system across Federal agencies and various levels of government to get smart synergy for recreation among other things (e.g. wildlife).
  - Focus on big issues and partnerships.
- Need a chosen leader within Congress and other water management agencies to assist the Corps in making smart decisions, dealing with policy issues, enforcement for recreational purposes, and environmental sustainability.
  - Requires an integrated framework, with better communication, more partnerships, and public education.
- *Corps*: Need to consider hydrologic options vis-à-vis recreation (fishing, boating) in everything we do.
  - Example: West Point, GA.
- Think about the consequences on recreation.

- Make recreational use a legitimate purpose for use/management where higher priority, funding, and recognition is given.
  - Need to review purpose and interpretation of Federal (Corps') authorities.
  - Need to plan and manage using an integrated framework and coordinate better.
  - Need to budget for recreation needs and benefits.
  - Requires change in culture and mindset.
- Develop attitudes to work smarter and more innovatively.
  - Need to apply "new thinking" towards recreation a la' the recreational lakes study.
- Question interpretation of acts that are 40 years old to accommodate new needs, values, and opportunities.
- *Federal government*: Re-look their understanding of recreational needs, plans, policies, interpretations, regulations, etc. across existing authorities and policies.
- *Federal government*: Start a leadership of agencies, where the Corps takes the lead and sets the example.
- *Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and non-Federal agencies*: Need to educate, communicate, foster partnerships, and integrate.
- Define what we want.
  - Boating, fishing, hiking, swimming, land management, and downstream activities.

Marine Transportation System Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- *Corps/Federal government*: Develop a long-range plan to solve problem of aging infrastructure.
  - Increase Federal funding.
  - Educate the public and lawmakers on why the funds are needed.
  - Problem can be solved by educating about the need.
- Expand and improve the locks for increased agricultural demand.
  - Maintenance of locks and dams (including channels) is important.
  - More funding necessary.
  - Have MTS function as an alternative for truck and rail.
- Modernization of ports and shipping channels.
  - Necessary for U.S. to compete in international trade.
  - Needs to be coordination between the states, federal government, and many stakeholders to try to find solutions (long-range plan).
  - Educate the public on the value of ports.
- Look at MTS as more than an economical method.
  - MTS reduces air pollution, complements truck and rail shipments, reduces congestion of other modes, and improves the overall quality of life.
  - All transportation modes need to apply a systems approach that includes MTS.
- Prepare for future impacts and how it will affect the prosperity of future generations.
- *Corps/Federal government*: Develop Federal partnerships for bigger Corps budget and environmental budget.
- Improve the old and obsolete navigation structure.

  - Big backlog in construction and maintenance that needs to be reduced.
  - Need to finish what has been started in a timely manner.
- Need over $6 billion annually to accomplish what needs to be done.
  - Current $4 billion is not enough.
- All stakeholders need to join together to plan and execute for the future of MTS.
  - Must include all forms of transportation to be successful.
- *Corps*: Recreational use needs to be factored in MTS planning and development.
  - Recreational boaters are often ignored; MTS focused on commerce.
  - Recreation is low on Corps priority, but is an important regional/local economic concern.
- *Federal government*: Need to address aging locks along St. Laurence Seaway.
  - Without expansion, it may become obsolete.
  - Currently can only accommodate 40% of the world's ships because of limited lock size.
  - All stakeholders must unify and consider cooperating more with Canada (on a financial and commercial level).
- *State and Federal government*: Work together and develop an intermodal plan for the future.
  - The Federal role is to educate the public, lawmakers and the media.
  - Need common MTS agenda.
- Consider the economic impacts of the inland waterway and MTS when conducting studies/plans.
  - *State and Federal government*: Need to market the inland waterways as a useful resource.
- U.S. needs to remain competitive in world market.
  - Global competition affects cost of goods.
  - U.S. has to keep up with world port growth.
- *Federal government*: Increase the public awareness relating to the value of MTS.
  - Promote like highway transportation system.
- Need a comprehensive plan that integrates all considerations (such as environmental impacts).
  - Decisions need to be made at a higher level than District (use congressional subcommittees).
  - *Corps*: Prioritize MTS improvements.
  - *Corps*: Corps in good position to provide data on MTS trade.
  - Problems with the benefit-cost analysis.
  - Focus on national benefits.
  - Consider dredge disposal and contamination.
- *Federal government*: Assist in deciding where funds should be allocated on a regional basis.
  - Resource allocation problem.
  - Corps weakness is that projects are decided on at the local level.
  - Need to look at MTS needs on a regional/national level (regional port planning process).
  - Need to decide where the most efficient investment of MTS funds should be.
  - MTS should be able to finance itself.
  - Cost sharing should continue.
- *Federal government*: Provide mechanisms for funding, coordination, system-wide economic evaluation, and information dissemination and education.

Federal Funding Theme

No formal notes were provided at part of this discussion. The group developed six categories of discussion and voted on each category to determine the priority level for discussion. Additionally, group members affixed stickies to the related category rather than writing notes. The following comments were developed from the information provided within the stickies and the report out on the discussion.

The category that received the most small group votes focused on inadequate funding for water related projects, with emphasis on local funding. The category receiving the second largest number of votes addressed the various roles relating to funding. Participants felt each agency should develop a specific funding role. The third category related to the annual process of fund allocation and related problems. The allocation of funds should be done with consistency and funds should be utilized when they are needed, not when they are made available. The fourth category dealt with the lack of coordination between agencies, stakeholders, and even within agencies. Potential solutions for this include developing multi-objective approaches and increasing interaction and communication within agencies and between agencies and stakeholders. The fifth category stressed the need for more accessible, understandable information related to funding programs and policies. Emphasis was given to making this information readily available to the private and public sectors. The final category the group discussed dealt with the issues associated with infrastructure operations and maintenance. The concern here was on the conflict of using funds for project completion and maintenance versus applying funds to new projects. Overall, this group did not clearly match roles with the various challenge categories presented during the discussion period. In general, however, it can be inferred that most of the discussion related to roles of *Federal and State government*.

Environmental/Ecosystem Health and Management Theme

As part of their discussion, this group developed 18 topic areas pertaining to the environment. The topic areas were climate, mitigation, cumulative impacts, biodiversity, hydrologic alterations, land use, stewardship, restoration, dredge materials, watershed management/supply, bioretention techniques, partnering/coordination, brownfields, fish passage, global sustainability, skills, and pollution. Because of time constraints, 5 topic areas were chosen for further discussion, which included climate, cumulative impacts, hydrologic alterations, restoration, and mitigation.

<u>Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles</u>

- *National Science Foundation*: Conduct research.
- *NOAA*: Conduct an assessment on climate change.
- *NASA and USGS*: Monitor and develop data.
- *Department of State*: Need to "get with the program."
- *IPCC*: Partner with other agencies.
- *Corps*: Reduce flooding risks using reforestation techniques and other non-structural options.

- *Department of Energy*: Explore alternative energy sources and increase research.
- *Environmental Protection Agency*: Focus on air quality.
- *Department of Transportation*: Develop a transportation policy.
- Need to fully understand the impact of projects on human health, the environment, and economy.
- Should take a systems approach to assessing impacts.
  - Current assessments to narrow.
- Develop tools that are more adequate.
- Form council to address environmental quality.
- Establish buy-in from State and local agencies.
- Include all agencies/entities at the beginning of projects.
- Need industry involvement.
- *Federal government*: Promote public involvement in decision making process.
- Need to mimic natural flow regime and restore waterways.
  - Dam removal.
  - Allow for fish passage.
  - Reconnect floodplains.
- *Corps*: Assure the maintenance of navigation permitting and regulation.
- *Federal government*: Need to provide better oversight.
- Need to align Federal agencies to allow for internal and external coordination.

Water Quality Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Provide quality water for rural communities and tribal lands.
  - Have better coordination among funding agencies and execution agencies.
  - Include technical assistance to help with the process.
- Address upstream/downstream issues and how they relate to different entities.
- Apply better land-based sediment management.
- Assess and control non-point pollution.
- Obtain water quality data that identifies problems and the severity of the problems.
  - Develop leadership and coordination forum; reinstitute water resource council.
- Maintain/improve water quality as part of Federal water resources projects.
- Monitor expected release of wastewater associated with conversion of agricultural water to M&I.
- Protect source water.
  - Implement incentives to protect water quality.
- Define and implement who's in charge of source water.
- Preserve and assure water quality protection as part of navigation.
- Apply greater integration of water quality assessment programs.
- *Federal government*: Implement integrated strategic planning at the Federal level for water quality protection.
- Determine Federal government role in TMDL planning.

- Address the continual pollution of groundwater and surface water with regulated and unregulated chemicals.
- *Federal government*: Develop North American water law treaties with U.S., Canada, and Mexico.
- Apply consistent, cohesive legislation/action on drinking water.
- Insure dredging doesn't cause saltwater intrusion of water supplies.
  - Potential to decrease groundwater supplies.
- Clean up toxic sediments that have impact on water quality.
- Do better in sharing known technologies among Federal agencies (all govt. levels) and the private sector.
- Minimize impacts to water quality during water resource projects by using environmental windows.
- Develop opportunities for integrating water quality into multi-purpose water resource projects.
- *Federal government*: Make source protection a priority of the Federal government for humans and the environment.
- Use holistic approach (watershed planning) when managing water resources.
  - Take land and air issues into account.

Floodplain Management Theme

Challenge Examples, Including Related Federal, State, or Local Roles

- Control un-wise development that continues within risk zone.
  - Concern heightened for safety of structures.
  - Potential increase in operation and maintenance of structures.
  - Inadvertent consequences, even with Federal projects.
  - Continual development creates false sense of security; inform public of risks.
- Increase opportunities to do more in protected floodways by fostering the maintenance of environmental restoration.
- *Federal government*: Provide Federal funding for the preservation (or restoration) of natural floodplain environments.
- Adjust formulation and evaluation processes to better weigh non-economic and environmental considerations.
  - Attach value to environmental enhancement and include in benefit-cost ratio.
- *FEMA*: Need better coordination between Federal and State agencies on planning and education programs.
- *FEMA/Corps*: Resolve unintended, conflicting policies and practices between agencies.
  - Examples: flood insurance regulations, Corps regulations.
  - Often can be resolved through better coordination, education, and true partnerships.
- Invest in model or creative responses.
  - Don't let up-front costs associated with plan development be a disincentive.
  - Recognize savings in subsequent repetitive applications.
  - Requires Federal agencies share lessons learned and model approaches with other State and local entities that are requesting projects.

- Develop clearinghouse for innovative solutions, model plans, and data.
- Large need for better coordination and sharing of agency data in various water resources areas.
  - Examples: water quality, storm water, emergency management, and water supply.
- Reactivate/re-energize Interagency Task Force on floodplain management.
- Modernize flood maps to assist in Federal, State, and local floodplain management.
- *Federal government/FEMA*: Provide substantial funding to allow for FEMA to modernize maps and make maps readily available.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Mr. Brown commented that participants were not limited to filling out stickies for the themes they discussed, but could also post them on the other themes posted around the room if they wished. Furthermore, Mr. Brown asked participants to fill out the comment sheet provided by the Corps. This information would assist the Corps in the review of the session and the procedural process associated with the forum. Mr. Brown also offered the inclusion of any statements participants may have brought with them. The list of stickies is included as Appendix A. Any public statements participants provided at the session are included as Appendix B. Lastly, Mr. Brown thanked the audience for their cooperation and involvement in the session and turned the floor over to General Van Winkle.

In closing, General Van Winkle thanked the facilitation team and supporting Corps members for their assistance in the session. Additionally, he acknowledged how important the participants' time was and thanked them for allocating their time well. He explained how he felt his time was also allocated effectively.

General Van Winkle went on to say that during the session he developed some parallels between the Corps and the famous explorers, Lewis and Clark. The first similarity was both were members of the Army. Thomas Jefferson felt it was very important to the newly formed Nation to set out on an expedition to study the western portion of the United States. His intent was to find a waterway that connected the east to the west. This expedition generated a lot of debate, but President Jefferson saw the expedition as something that needed to be done in order to continue the success of the Nation. General Van Winkle added, this same national commitment is something the existing Nation needs to continue to maintain sustainability for the future. Another purpose of the early expedition was to develop peaceful relations with Native Americans and establish reliable trade routes. An indirect benefit from the expedition was the extensive botanical identification that occurred. General Van Winkle explained that this multi-purpose function was also evident in the sessions. After the Lewis and Clark expedition was completed, Lewis failed to effectively disperse the information generated from the expedition, which proved to be a major downfall. General Van Winkle felt the dispersal of information generated at the sessions would also be a challenge. This challenge would need to be looked at carefully and effective dispersal of information would be very important. He admitted the Corps would be a major contributor to the distribution and the subsequent application of the information generated at the sessions. General Van Winkle felt the Corps was configured to

accomplish this, but also felt the Corps needed to adapt to the changing times. Additionally, the Corps intended to continue the listening session approach with other agencies and related stakeholders, but how and when this would occur was unknown. General Van Winkle then introduced an assortment of senior members of the Corps and briefly explained their involvement in the sessions.

General Van Winkle made a commitment to the audience that the Corps would strive to increase communication and coordination with other agencies and related stakeholders, but admitted this task would be challenging. Ultimately, the balance of water resources uses would need to occur. General Van Winkle stressed that this cannot be accomplished solely at the Federal level, but must include State and local participation. The problem with this partnership becomes apparent when trying to accommodate the many interests and needs of the various entities. General Van Winkle then made a comparison to how water resources were managed in Europe. He explained that the management of water resources in Europe was not sufficient and we needed to avoid the same results in our Nation. General Van Winkle felt the key to successfully managing our water resources would be to generate useful information and develop beneficial solutions that would allow for a balance of water resources uses. The information generated from the 14 regional listening sessions and 2 national listening sessions would assist in future Corps operations. The information would also be useful for other agencies and their respective operations.

General Van Winkle stated that the 21st century would be much different than the 20th century and the Corps needed to adapt to these changes. With that, General Van Winkle thanked the participants for their involvement and reminded them that they could provide additional comments and questions at any time by contacting the Corps or visiting the Corps website. He added that a report of the session activities would be produced and made available at the Corps website for review. General Van Winkle thanked the audience again and concluded the session.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
THEME 1		
Integrated Water Resources Management and Planning		
	NO COMMENTS	
THEME 2		
Communication and Coordination		
	Better coordination at staff and management levels between Corps and federal resource agencies.	Need to have better communication, coordination, and information exchange. Need to engage at all levels, including headquarters. An example of information that needs to be better coordinated is the status of permits. Some often get issued without warning. Also, with the long timeline of civil works project, the stakeholders need to be updated on project status.
THEME 3		
Regulatory Issues/Aspects of Water Resources.		
	Update 404(b) MOA with agencies	Better coordination with resource agencies.
	Better impact assessment of permitted projects.	Need to understand full project impacts. Better evaluation of environmentally friendly alternatives.
	Adequate mitigation and monitoring.	Need to replace ALL lost functions and monitor the success of mitigation.
	Current regulatory programs for water-related issues need to be integrated into other requirements to the extent possible, such as NEPA assessments and documentation. The Corps should commit to a streamlined regulatory function that integrates with other programs as much as possible.	The public is demanding efficient and responsive government programs at all levels. Water-related regulatory programs are no exception.
THEME 4		
Floodplain Management.		
	Necessary for protection and continued utility of farmland resources	Some of the most productive farmland in U.S., primarily in Mississippi River Basin, needs flood protection to be productive.
	GIS based flood stage mapping. Note: Also applies to Communication and Coordination.	Integration of FEMA damage data with GIS based flood stage mapping would be a useful tool for state and local decisions. It

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
		would be most helpful in determining high-risk areas and for directing emergency management needs.
	Use of GIS floodplain data.	These data can be used for other purposes such as recreational maps. Suggest the Corps work with NOAA and FEMA to make data available to other agencies.
	Fund Corps Challenge 21 Program.	New program will allow the Corps to expand efforts at non-structural approaches to flood damage reduction. Authorized 1999, has received no funding from Congress/leaves Corps without key flood damage reduction tool.
	Current/up-to-date SLOSH (sea, lake, overland storm surge hazard) model information. Annual fly-over of hurricane prone state coastline to collect digital orthos. Incorporate annual coastal digital orthographic with SLOSH, Q3 data.	Better response to flood disasters such as a result of hurricanes.
	To better support flood control project development that takes into account multiple community development and environmental planning objectives.	Less inadvertent encouragement of unwise development, better environmental planning. Significant increase in funding and role for FloodPlain Management Services and Planning Assis. to States programs at Corps. Corps Challenge 21 program has great potential as vehicle for innovative approaches. Needs more funding.
	Many floodplains are devoid of any ecological health. They are treated as utilitarian serviceways for stormwater evacuation, instead of as areas bordering natural river systems.	Loss of ecological areas leads to a decreased quality of life for humans as well as other biological communities.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Current/up-to-date Q3 data nationwide. Ability to turn Q3 data into impact information (i.e. how many homes/businesses will be flooded and how bad?).	Assist with disaster planning and response. Assist with mitigation efforts. Advocate for people not to live in floodplains. New/better models (like HAZUS).
	One-stop shot for data (Q3, dams, levees, etc.) (EPA - surf your watershed, USGS – real-time streamflow, NWS – quantitative precipitation forecast (QPF)).	Ability to better respond to flood disasters.
THEME 5		
Marine Transportation System.		
	Improve efficiency, financing improvements, through sharing costs with users. Strive for greater user financing.	Many inland waterways are carrying low volumes and have high costs – User fees could help make more economical – Update and review the MTS.
	MTS – need is to modernize inland waterway infrastructure to allow greater capacity and efficiency.	Inland waterway transportation offers low-cost bulk transportation that affords low consumer prices and higher producer prices, while also reducing road and rail congestion, as well as reducing emissions (both modal savings and the emission results of highway gridlock).
	Environmental Impact Evaluation for existing MTS/Rehabilitation Plans/New Facilities Re-evaluate for all elements of MTS periodically.	MTS has major, often ongoing, impacts on the environment e.g. fisheries, wildlife habitat, wetlands – dredge disposal becoming increasing problem of environment/cost.
	Regional port planning to assure efficient national transportation system.	All ports cannot provide all services. Need to identify where most appropriate services should be located considering costs, environment, and markets.
	Clean up sediments associated with dredging activities.	Need to identify sources and levels of toxics in existing sediments. Establish incentives to control sediment runoff to reduce costs and environmental impacts.
	To look at the MTS – waterways, ports and intermodal connections as a critical system that links up with the landside	MTS ownership and management are shared by private and public sectors but country as a whole benefit economically.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	system. Lack of recognition of importance of MTS and how dependent everyone is on it for the goods they use everyday.	System has basically taken care of itself historically, but infrastructure is aging and MTS needs the same attention /funding that highways, air and rail get. MTS needs a single spokesman/champion at the national level like other modes to ensure it gets the attention it needs at the highest national level.
	Lack of coordination/communication between agencies that share responsibility for some aspect of the system. Compete for limited federal funding without collaborating on what the needs are.	Duplication of effort is costly and inefficient. Agencies serve the public, so actions should be prioritized to address their priorities.
	Waterways infrastructure is old, deteriorating and in some cases obsolete – need for capital improvement.	Trade and commercial development is growing – we need an effective, efficient marine transportation system to meet today and tomorrow's growing needs.
		To develop a comprehensive marine transportation plan that recognizes the environmental factors and infrastructure/limitations of our nation ports. Why – to reduce the my port needs to be deeper than your port game and better integrate marine transportation with other modes of transportation.
	Problem – making all ports adapt to the vessels being built rather than the other way around.	Solution – develop a nationwide system of deepwater ports integrated with a smaller coastal shipping system that can service ports with shallower drafts.
		The needs of recreational boaters are often neglected in planning and management of waterways –dredging, lock and dam operations, general maintenance.
		Economic impacts of local economies (particularly recreation's impact) not factored in funding/priorities for operations and maintenance (i.e., dredging shallow draft harbors, lock operations).
	Recreational river navigation (boating) should be given consideration in all navigation plans.	Recreation is a growing industry and navigation at project sights for recreational purposes is important.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
		The focus of Marine Transportation System management and policy is directed at the commercial sector almost exclusively while the waterway system and infrastructure serves or affects others interests as well (i.e., recreation, environmental quality).
	Bi-national aging infrastructure throughout the system, locks in the St. Lawrence Seaway can accommodate only 40% of world vessels, almost no U.S. flag vessels. Marine transportation is the most environmentally friendly and safe mode, should be encouraged and supported.	We can't afford to let the St. Lawrence Seaway become obsolete – there is not enough rail and truck capacity to absorb the cargo that currently transits the seaway.
	Agriculture needs the system to efficiently move ag products, primarily bulk grain, to foreign markets. Improved, expanded locks, modernized ports for barge and ship transport.	An efficient and cost competitive water transport system makes U.S. products competitive globally and provides a necessary alternative to rail and highway transport for farm products.
	Getting state and federal agencies involved in maritime, intermodal, and water issues to work together more closely and come up with common agenda's.	Without getting these state and federal agencies to work more closely together, you get grid lock which results in little or no progress on affirmative sectors.
	The condition and moderation of ports and shipping channels.	Over the next 20 years trade is expected to increase. Most is expected to move by water.
	Opportunity to facilitate domestic and global commerce.	Economic, community and employment benefits. Federal government should help develop and maintain infrastructure and encourage intermodal coordination.
	Aging infrastructure; need vision for the future-a waterways infrastructure that will meet 21st century needs; need increased federal funding for waterways development and improvement.	If improvements are not made now there will be catastrophic failure of the waterways system in the 21st century; waterborne transportation is the most environmentally and economically viable choice for the future.
	Promote alternatives for dredged material disposal and contaminated sediment treatment technologies need to be developed.	Because disposal of sediments including contaminated and "clean" is a major water quality problem and opportunities exist in the private sector and they need to be developed.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
THEME 6		
Environmental/Ecosystem Health and Management.		
	Study of hydrological systems.	Impacts to climate change.
	Human interference.	Impacts natural system.
	Climate change and other systems human impacts.	Overrides all water planning, ecosystem management, and biodiversity conservation issues. Mitigation and adaptation needed.
	Global warming.	Coastal problems; sea level rise.
	Ensuring that environmental restoration/preservation is seriously considered when conducting all types of projects and if damage is too great to mitigate (onsite, no banks) it's not constructed in the first place; need to stop the "destroy then repair" practices.	
	Respecting and observing current environmental laws (NEPA, clean water).	
	Habitat destruction; need for restoration/mitigation/avoidance.	Reduces necessary habitat.
	Adequate mitigation and full replacement of lost functions.	Full replacement of lost functions.
	Avoiding and mitigating impacts to aquatic resources.	Protect existing resources (and their functions and values). Corps should have preference for non-structural approaches. Corps should improve avoidance and mitigation.
	Conflicting and competing values and uses.	This is important to facilitate a fair and equible use of public lands in an environmentally responsible manner.
	Cumulative impacts.	Cumulative impacts are poorly understood but can cause significant harm. Coordinate with other agencies and improve technology.
	Considering cumulative impacts of projects within the same watershed (i.e. effects of riprap, floodwall, wetland destruction, increased barge traffic).	
	Evaluation and monitoring of projects (civil works and 404 permits).	Need to better look at success of project at meeting its planned objectives, especially as they relate to impacts.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Full evaluation of project impacts (individual and cumulative).	Need to do better evaluation of direct, indirect. Look at civil works and 404/10 permit projects.
	Draining aquifers.	Pressure on water quality (as there is less dilution) and increased drought, eventually leading to loss of water source.
	Endangered species loss.	Impacts on biodiversity.
	Invasive species.	Impact biological "checks and balances" – biodiversity.
	Invasive/exotic species.	Impacts ability of indigenous species to compete.
	Review past completed projects for opportunities to restore habitat for human communities and wildlife to restore bio-diversity.	
	Over development of rivers.	Reduction of riparian areas; increased flooding in some cases, leading to higher insurance costs.
	Hydrologic alteration; dam reoperation.	Affects natural ecosystems needed for bio-diversity.
	Fish passage at the Corps projects and other blockages.	Improve anadromous, catdromous and resident fish access to needed habitat. Federal role; significant.
	Watershed level restoration.	Many issues can be addressed by looking at larger level.
	Wise stewardship of environmental resources in world economy.	For our economic and social survival.
	Too focused on structural solutions.	Restoration projects often are best accomplished with non-structural solutions, but Corps seems to focus on structural options first.
	Using state of the art science to implement restoration projects (as well as when analyzing damage caused by other projects and mitigated effectively).	Administrative change: allow Corps planners to use existing studies and expertise.
	Restoration of lost wetlands and riparian areas in small or large watersheds.	Water supplies and water quality.
	Restoration of aquatic resources.	Improve ecosystem health, water quality, and recreational opportunities. Restoration should be central part of Corps plan.
	Beneficial use of dredged material.	Need to explore options and not always pick the least cost option.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Boost funding/caps for environmental continuing authorities (1135,206,204 – Challenge 21).	
	Funding (lack of integrated mechanisms).	This is vital to securing the necessary skills and expertise in getting the job done.
	Bio-retention techniques.	
	Work with multiple stakeholders for success.	Environmental resolutions are often best accomplished through broad-based coalitions. Corps could improve their restoration work by developing mechanisms to work with multiple groups.
	Over regulation.	Avoid gridlock.
	Brownfields issues.	To allow sale and investment in property; liability concerns.
	Need to find ecologically compatible land and water uses.	
	Watershed management.	Improve efficiency and effectiveness of water programs through place-based, collaborative environmental management.
	Uncontrolled development (sprawl).	Puts pressure on the environment through the reduction of wilderness or buffering zones and problems such as increased traffic.
	Fresh water and other resource sustainability.	Impacts on world population.
	Build on everglades model or build on successes.	Educating Corps employees often are not told of environmental success stories that could improve their work. Should be investigated to see how Corps could work on large and small efforts.
	Lack of knowledge and research (knowledge and skills gap).	In order to do the best job we must have the science upon which to base our decision.
	Develop efficient mass transit system to minimize air pollution.	
	Endocrine disrupters.	Impact on future generations.
	Naturally occurring toxic constituents.	Movement and distribution impacted by stream channel development.
	Non-economic environmental benefits are not assigned values in cost/benefit analysis. Ex: benefits such as sediment reduction, nutrient removal and carbon dioxide uptake of restored natural areas.	Several recent Corps flood control projects (yazoo, St.Johns/New Madrid) do not adequately consider functions/benefits of natural area restoration, and focus solely on increased dollar value of agricultural

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
		production at the expense of the environment. Involved valuation of non-structural environmental benefits could result in smaller, less environmentally damaging flood damage reduction projects and greatly reduced mitigation cost.
	Revise COE policies to promote better integration of land use and watershed planning and management on a regional basis.	Water resources and water infrastructure are a driver of sprawl if their planning and management are not integrated with land use planning and management.
	Utilize COE resources to help close the drinking water and wastewater infrastructure-funding gap over the next 20 years.	EPA and others have done studies showing that there will be a multi billion-dollar infrastructure-funding gap, due in part to a decrease in Federal funding.
	Better integration of Federal water policies and programs within and across agency lines.	The multiplicity of Federal agencies involved in water programs may find themselves working at cross purposes if there is not better coordination of their policies.
	1) Aquatic nuisance species control and elimination. 2) Safe disposal of dredged materials.	1) ANS are major problem, especially in Great Lakes. Need for Federal coordinated response as opposed to state by state piecemeal regulations. 2) Construction of new locks on seaway and channel deepening will require dredging. Need to address disposal in way to meet environmental concerns.
	Revise COE policies to discourage sprawl and promote "smart growth".	COE policies and funding decisions can be a powerful deterrent to sprawl and provide incentives for smarter growth and ecosystem preservation.
THEME 7		
Federal Funding.		
	Which federal agency should do the work USACE, EPA or other.	Other agencies have established important projects that should not be duplicated.
	What is the role of the Federal government, state and local and regional governments? This question needs to be addressed.	The Corps can unintentionally crowd out work that could be better done by state or local governments or by the private sector.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Reduce taxpayer outlay/liability for local projects.	Important federal needs lack funding and taxpayers are instead supporting local projects through federal cost shares. The local projects should be locally supported.
	Beneficiary pays is an important principle to include in funding decisions.	Needs are limitless. But I need less if I have to pay. Paying adds needed discipline to the decision-making process.
	Civil works budget is stagnant, but demands on funds have grown- need to increase overall funds available.	Backlog is growing; infrastructure is aging- need to address with broader funding- rather then by subdividing the "pie" so that needs are less funded.
	Increase funding/appropriations for Corps of Engineers programs and projects.	Meeting growing infrastructure/project needs around country and address backlog of projects. Federal role: work with Congress and agencies to increase overall funding.
	Inadequate Federal funding to meet the needs in water resource area.	Many needs are not being met.
	Lack of funds for local projects.	Yes, there is a Federal role. Most communities can not afford to pay for needed repair to systems.
	Identifying how much is currently being spent on water resource issues.	Current approach of agency based budgets makes it difficult to identify what' currently being spent- results in diffusion of dollars to projects irrespective of need and priority.
	Lack of communication of current funding.	Should be at state level.
	Beneficiary pays are a useful principle to adopt.	Beneficiary pays adds discipline to the decision-making process. People do not waste resources if they have to pay themselves.
	Repair and replace aging water and wastewater infrastructure systems across the country. There is a federal role for this challenge. There is a precedent for a federal trust fund (similar to TEA21 AIR21).	Human health and safety. The timing is excellent for an enhanced federal role in water infrastructure because there s broad, bi-partisan support on Capitol Hill and we currently have the largest budget surplus in history.
	What is the appropriate role for the Federal government? Local state and regional governments?	It makes little sense to me to have people in Philadelphia say, pay for yacht basins in San Diego, for example. Why not have programs paid for and implemented at non federal level?

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Define and coordinate role of Federal, state, local and private agencies in the following areas. (Funding, planning, management, operations & maintenance, regulating, monitoring)	
	Appropriate Federal agency.	Corps, EPA, BW Rec.
	Deciding how to allocate available funding.	Need to concentrate available funding on highest priority projects given that needs exceed available money. Cost sharing isn't necessarily the most efficient approach.
	Annual funding process and duration of Corps review process lead to increased project costs both for non-federal and federal sponsor.	While some projects go through years of review, real estate costs in some areas are escalating.
	Federal fiscal policy of closing out books each fiscal year. Can't carry over funds from 1 year to the next.	Policy leads to wasteful spending at the end of each fiscal project cost more.
	Multi-objective projects, which include environmental restoration components, need to be addressed fairly. Current NED process needs to be reviewed.	A multi-objective project may in many cases address a number of critical needs in the community.
	Lack of coordinating structure and forums - interagency and intergovernmental.	Single track targeting of expenditures within single agency and level of government works against balanced and efficient approaches.
	Non-federal sponsor should receive credit for actual costs. Sponsor should receive credit for CERCIA-related costs.	Current cost sharing process allows for federal contribution to be addressed and reflected, but is unfair to non-federal sponsor.
	Balancing the regulatory and relief programs with the structural and action programs.	Inefficient expenditures, lack of holistic solutions, perpetuation of problems.
	Develop accessible, comprehensive source to access information on federal funding available to private business sector (other than non-profits).	There are many federal agencies and offices, and information is scattered.
	Information: Need to make program/policy info understandable; need to reach out to "client" base to make info and assistance available.	Info needs to be less legalistic; easy to get to from all levels.
	Maintenance, operation adaptation of existing projects to new circumstances.	Adopting existing projects to new purposes.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Funding associated with maintaining existing infrastructure vs. funding for installation of new projects.	Can forget what we have and watch the system deteriorate like the highway system. Spend all our funds on existing and forgetting to help those that were not helped yet.
THEME 8		
Water Quality.		
	Source water protection.	To protect and/or restore water quality for human consumption and protect eco-systems.
	Protect ground water and surface water from contamination from agricultural waste.	Large areas of country are dependent on groundwater supplies, which are at risk from agricultural land use.
	Provide quality water for rural communities and tribal.	Rural communities often lack financial resources for upgrading water and wastewater infrastructure to comply with federal/state regulations and protection of public health and environment.
	Land based sediment management.	To minimize expenses associated with dredging and sediment disposal, there is a role for federal government in preventing siltation and sediment runoff. Also minimizes costs associated with management of contaminated sediments.
	Non point source pollutant control is a major challenge particularly in and around developing areas. The Federal government needs to provide leadership, technical assistance, and funding to assess and resolve the problem.	Non point source pollutants are easily identified or controlled, yet they are the remaining major water quality challenge. They affect drinking water, fish and wildlife habitat, and other water uses.
	Small systems competing economically.	Economics of scale; availability of funding; technical assistance.
	There is no widely accepted way to assess impacts to receiving waters. The Federal government should take the lead and assist the states.	With differing techniques in place-dispersion, dilution, toxicity, etc., assessment is inefficient and often misrepresents actual conditions.
	Unmet water quality/treatment needs of small and rural communities and tribes. Does the current Federal approach address the needs (includes supply and wastewater treatment)?	Increasing congressional action to interpose Corps in role that in past belonged to states/local entities and EPA. What is needed? What should the Federal role be? Who should fulfill that role?

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Maintaining and improving water quality at Federal water resources projects.	Possible conflicts among statutory purposes; cost of project modification.
	Pollution of surface and groundwater with unregulated substances.	Environmental and health hazards of long-term exposure- e.g. Chlorine.
	Opportunity to use wetlands restoration and protection to improve water quality.	Win-win for people and environment.
	Opportunity to integrate water quality into multiple purpose water projects planning?	Concerns about "who pays?" cause missed opportunities and misrepresented project benefits (confusing water quality, environmental restoration and recreation).
	Water quality; benefit/cost analysis of control mechanisms.	To prioritize funding.
	Integrating water quality technology among federal agencies (and staff government and the private sector).	To be efficient-wetlands are a great example of cooperation and technology sharing.
	Bringing the best Federal expertise to bear on animal waste management problems.	Confined animal feeding operations are a major source of material damaging water quality.
	Recycling residual/waste products-manure/scoff, etc. or finding new uses for them.	To prevent them from becoming potential water pollution inputs.
	Water quality –data information.	Just what are problems and where are they located? Needed for TMDL preparations and economic impact analysis.
	Water quality –incentives for voluntary non point source pollution control.	The regulatory approach is too expensive and administratively difficult (for non point source) control.
	Ensure dredging does not cause salt-water intrusion in source water aquifers.	To protect drinking water.
	Clean up toxic sediments that pose water quality impacts.	Because these lead to public health threats.
	Minimize water quality impacts of water resource projects through the use of environmental windows.	To protect water and habitat quality.
	Source water protection.	Expensive to treat a limited source; always cheaper to protect then to treat. Federal role –communicating to the public the importance of protecting our water source.
	Source water protection; strategic planning.	Minimizing requirement for treatment; keeping cost reasonable. Federal role-stricter enforcement especially to industry polluters.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Water quality assessment is currently not an integrated program. The Federal government needs to look broadly at assessments on a watershed scale in order to design and implement improvement strategies and programs.	Assessment suffers from inefficiencies, techniques that provide contrary results, jurisdiction disputes and widely different interpretation of data and other results. If we are to adequately plan for water quality improvement we need a great deal more standardization.
	Define and implement who is "in charge" of source water protection.	Too many agencies involved; not allowing forward progress to proceed at a reasonable pace.
	Water quality protection needs to be assured in waterborne navigation.	Many aspects of navigation, including dredging, port development and waterway improvements, cause environmental impacts. Since the economy depends in part on fisheries, tourism, and recreation we need to protect water quality.
	Hypoxic zone in Gulf of Mexico has potential impacts on agricultural production in Upper Mississippi River Basin by reducing input in order to reduce non-point source water quality impacts. Look at diversion/flow in Mississippi/Atchafalaya.	Non-point source issues need to be addressed but flow control diversions in lower Mississippi must also be explored as to how that can impact the hypoxic zone.
	Co-mingling of water sources with either being "upstream" or "downstream" of another entity (state or city).	Need a cohesive strategy that defines an entire water source.
THEME 9		
Emergency Response.		
	Funding for emergency response.	Existing processes under the Federal Response Plan led by FEMA for allocating Federal funding are complicated and paperwork intensive. Decision process may not lead to funding; highest priority needs of local community.
	Inconsistent organizational framework for coordinating during an emergency.	There are numerous organizational frameworks/structures in place at the Federal, state and local level to coordinate actions during an emergency. Inconsistencies in these structures lead to short falls in efficient/effective use of resources. NIIMS ICS provides such a common framework; many but not all

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
		Federal agencies have adopted.
THEME 10		
Water Supply.		
	Fresh water supply is dropping; Federal government can help state/local governments develop water resource plans. Important to think of effects of water use on a watershed level over time. If you're using water, where's it coming from, and can it be replaced?	Greatest small water system concern is being able to meet demand. Water aquifers are drying up, drought conditions becoming more frequent.
THEME 11		
Wastewater Collection.		
	NO COMMENTS	
THEME 12		
General Water Resources Infrastructure (not otherwise classified).		
	NO COMMENTS	
THEME 13		
Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination.		
	Additional resources need to be provided for streamflow data collection and analysis. The U.S. Geological Survey's National Stream-flow Information Program (NSIP) should be embraced by any dealing with surface water and fully funded by Congress.	Without this information, very few of the other challenges can be addressed with much accuracy or confidence.
	Sharing of GIS data.	GIS data should be shared with all agencies. Suggest data to be placed on a clearinghouse site within each district.
	Problem –lack of good integration with other data groups.	Due to lack of good integration of Corps survey data to other data with groups such as NOAA, NGS, and USGS there is unneeded duplication of data gathering and underutilization of data that has been gathered because it is difficult to access the data. Also, data quality parity with other agencies is a problem. There needs to be a Corps data clearinghouse and the districts need to be compelled to share their project within the Corps (at a minimum).

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
THEME 14		
Corps Planning Process.		
	Corps project delivery process; need to re-examine study methodologies, especially economic principles and guidelines for cost/benefit studies.	The current methodologies have been the subject of wide spread criticism. We need a methodology that is designed to more accurately measure all costs and benefits, and one that has a better reputation for integrity and legitimacy.
	Difficult to do small restoration projects.	Corps process makes it difficult to conduct small restoration projects in an effective and efficient manner.
THEME 15		
Federal and Corps Water Resources Policy.		
	Federal agencies, specifically the Corps, need to be more transparent and credible.	Thus, numerous environmental and taxpayer groups advocate the same common sense reforms, including independent review of large/controversial projects; full concurrent mitigation; post project monitoring to learn from mistakes/successes; increased stakeholder involvement. It's imperative we work together.
THEME 16		
Recreation		
	With water quality improvements has come expansion of recreation activity and also challenges. On Potomac River, for example, new safety, fish poaching, vandalism, litter problems. Reduces recreation experiences needlessly.	New cooperation efforts by Federal, state, local agencies and NGO's.
	Beach replenishment.	Recreational needs of beaches appear to take priority over recreational needs elsewhere.
	Fish health.	Dredging may cause disturbance of contaminated sediments.
	Lack of recreational opportunities/resources (marinas, docks, etc.) in tidal Delaware.	Many boaters in the Delaware will travel to the Chesapeake for recreation. Others prefer to keep boats in Chesapeake Bay areas. Role: Utilize Federal facilities.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Debris in Delaware River and estuary.	Hazardous to recreational boater. Numerous repairs are required each year. These can be readily documented. Role: remove debris.
	Planning should involve all users relating to downstream recreation.	Each persons (groups) recreational issues can be addressed to ensure everyone's needs are met concerning lake levels.
	Plans need to be updated to meet current economic, environmental and flood control issues.	Plans are outdated and do not meet current issues concerning the growth in recreational interests.
	Releases from the dam during times of highest potential use (meaning June – August).	Releases during April and October because of temperature do no bring as high a number of participants as releases during the prime whitewater recreation season.
	Recreational releases from the Savage River Dam coinciding with Jennings Randolph releases.	To have a secondary river of a higher difficulty available simultaneous with Jennings Randolph releases to bring further use and higher economic value.
	Scheduled recreational releases at least one year in advance.	To plan trips to these areas.
	Downstream recreation opportunities.	Economic boost to areas with Corps dams in the east. There are less then 300 total miles available for whitewater recreation, areas below dams are prime areas because of controlled flows.
	1) Aquatic ecosystems degraded by Corps hydrological? alterations (DO, siltation, flow rates).	
	2) Corps treatment unbalanced for environmental issues.	
	3) Environment degradation adversely affects recreational and commercial fishing and natural resources sustainability.	
	4) Hardware upgrades needed to more accurately control flow rates at gates (fluctuating flow rates to be avoided); = budget preplanning.	
	Balancing the needs of various recreation types and finding suitable multiple use management solutions.	Public waters should be open to everyone. The key is finding the appropriate method of respectively everyone's interest.
	Continue to expand communication and education between boating industry and	To meet needs of boaters (including personal watercraft users) along with law

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Federal agencies (including ACE) on issues such as law enforcement, access and safety.	enforcement officials and natural resource managers: must know issues well to best determine policy.
	Access to facilities.	Need quality roads for towing boats, parking sites, restroom facilities and launch sites to the water.
	Education of/on maintaining a quality experience that can be shared by a multitude of users.	Everyone wants to recreate and enjoy the "peace" of the experience.
	Sharing of water by the diverse boater/boating participants i.e. motorboat, sail, PWC's, tubing, water-ski, etc.	Some have their need to be a balance among the many "boating" users.
	Involve the manufactures of recreation in the dialogue.	They should be able to provide hands on experience of what the "users" want and are asking for in the product, which can translate into the "resources", they are using.
	Corps ability to manage lake areas in cooperation with other state and local agencies.	Forming partnerships that enhance the quality of the recreation services provided.
	Corps ability to manage for quality recreation experiences.	Visitor satisfaction, quality recreation, adequate facilities.
	Corps ability to manage for recreation in an environmentally friendly manner.	Environmental impacts may decrease visitor satisfaction.
	Developing downstream recreation policy so that initiatives can be developed through Corps.	Right now only alternative seems to be Congressional Legislation to get things done.
	Summer downstream recreational releases on north branch of Potomac.	Economic impact!! Fulfilling unmet need for downstream recreation along West Virginia, Western Maryland border.
	Moderation of the National Distress and SAR system.	.
	Re-establishing requirement for VHF licensing.	
	Balanced approach to no discharge zones.	
	Implementations of the Boating Infrastructure Grant Program.	
	Modernization of the LORAN C; continuation of LORAN C.	
	Equitable distribution of Wallop-Brean funding between fish restoration and recreational boating; boating safety.	

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
	Dredging to support recreational boating.	Urban sprawl is clogging up our inland waterways.
	Downstream recreation needs.	Inadequate consideration of whitewater activity needs in release scheduling.
	National recreation lakes program.	900 million recreational visits annually; $1 billion + O & M backlog; overcrowded and outdated facilities; inadequate access; failure to consider recreation in lake level changes.
	Information about recreation opportunities.	Use distributed geographically or by day/season; better info can help; also can direct uses to areas best suited for experiences (i.e., quiet fishing spots vs. active fun).
	Concessions policy.	Unclear and non-encouraging policies regarding allowable private investments in recreational facilities at Corps lakes, especially beyond marinas.
	Lake using zoning and management.	Better systems to zone recreational use on crowded lakes to reduce conflicts promote safety and federal/state/local coordination of management of these policies.
	Recreation fees.	Retention of fees at connection site is difficult (subject to provisions allowing retention of only fees above current level collections).
	Cost/share recreation facilities; rehabilitation needed as leases near expiration.	Corps policy does not allow cost share funding of reconstruction; should be changed.
THEME 17		
Smart Growth and Development.		
	How to manage smart growth in a manner to house the lower economic population and move these people to their jobs.	The potential effect of smart growth is to raise the cost of housing to levels the lower economic population cannot afford. They would be forced to inner city or rural areas.
	Sprawl; Federal government can assist states/local government in developing smart growth programs to protect both the environment, quality of life and economy.	Sprawl introduces a host of problems ranging from pollution from autos, longer commute times, destruction of wilderness by development and road building, and loss of a sense of community.

COMMENTS ON "STICKIES" COLLECTED AT WASHINGTON D.C. LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	**Challenge**	**Why challenge is important?**
THEME 18		
Coastal/Shoreline Management.		
	Reduce taxpayer outlay/liability for local projects.	Federal funds are needed for important restoration programs –local projects benefit locals primarily. So locals should pay a greater share. Federal taxpayers should not bear the costs of these local programs; rather those resources should be leveraged toward beneficial national programs.
	Shoreline erosion; lack of comprehensive plan that addresses impacts to habitats and infrastructure.	Impacts from shoreline hardening. Of our coasts is resulting in the continued degradation of our coastal environments. Particularly as sea level rise impacts our beaches and wetlands a long-range plan for how to deal with coastal development and non developed shorelines.
OTHER		
	Funding; not utilizing existing funds due to a lack of local match.	Solution: Coastal America's newest initiative- the Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership (CWRP) is a new partnership between the 12 Federal departments and corporate America that will serve to fill in these funding needs.
	Corps should serve as environmental assessment and remediation of impacts from all federal agencies; including military, executive and legislative branches.	
	Common regulatory standards (state and federal).	Multi states operations have to have common standards to adhere to. Problem arises when one state has different standards from nation.

APPENDIX B

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENT AND MATERIALS